This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 00605622 4

896

Presented by

E. H. Van Ness, Esq.

to the

New York Public Library

THE

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION,

BY

AMOS DEAN, LL.D.

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

VOL. VII.

ALBANY, N. Y.:
JOEL MUNSELL.
1869.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1869,

By A. H. Dean,

In the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States,
for the Northern District of New York.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations.
1906

30375

CONTENTS.

EUROPEAN ART.

		Page.
Objective Arts,	Architecture,	6
	Sculpture,	82
	Painting,	128
Subjective Arts,	Music,	261
	Poetry,	304
	Eloquence,	424
Mixed Arts,	The Drama,	460
	The Military Art,	516
Index,		599
List of Subscribers,		625

HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION.

EUROPEAN ART.

Art, in some of its phases, is wholly wedded to the beautiful; and may be expressed as thought realized in some form of beauty or sublimity. This relates more especially to the fine arts; those of architecture, sculpture, and painting; in which the forms of physical beauty are so moulded by the hand of genius as to serve a higher purpose in the production of moral beauty. The arts of a people are, however, by no means limited to those of design. The mental arts of music, poetry, and eloquence, possess as strong a claim upon the æsthetic nature of man as those of architecture, sculpture, and painting. Nor is a limit found here. There is art in dramatic representation. There is art in sieges and battles; in attack and defense. The question then arises, how are we to define art in its most extensive signification? What is the subject upon which it operates? What is the reason or final cause of its operation? And where is the limit or ultimate termination of all its action?

Let us say then that art is "an habitual power in man, of becoming the cause of some effect, according to a system of various and well approved precepts." That it is a power wielded by man for the production of some effect is obvious. The habit of its exercise is also essential to con-

stitute the artist, because no purely instinctive or impulsive action can ever be artistic. Again, its exercise must be guided. The canons of art, its rules and precepts, must be obeyed. When this habitual power is directed in its exercise according to a system of well approved rules and precepts, the result is a creation of art.

The next inquiry relates to the subject upon which it operates. And the answer here is, that "it is only on the contingent, which is within the reach of the human powers to influence." The great primal causes that lie at the foundation of all movement, the essential essences of things, the immutable and necessary in nature, that with which science is more strictly conversant, can never become the subject of art. All these can be influenced by no other than the power which has created them. But there is a lower order of existences, such as the elements and their different combinations, which are subject to interruptions, variations, and contingences, and these lie within the domain of art. Such are earth, air, water, fire, vegetables, animals, man. These may be influenced by human power, and may, therefore, become the subjects of art.

If we have found a subject upon which art can operate, and if, in its operation, it becomes the cause which, acting upon a system of rules, precepts and canons, becomes productive of some effect, it is obvious there must be something to set this machinery in motion, some reason to which this active agency may be traced, some final cause or motive adequate to set it in operation. The next inquiry naturally arising is, where shall we find this? It exists in the yearnings of our æsthetic nature after some imaginary good. But this good, although not capable of strict definition, may, nevertheless, be reduced within certain limits. It must not be of impossible attainment. To seek seriously after that which belongs to higher natures, and can minister only to their enjoyment, would mark the maniac, and not the reasonable man. Neither must it be a good that has no relation to human life, or any of its

pursuits. It may be a fancied good to fly like the eagle, or to possess the physical power of the lion, but no sane dreamer would ever expect either. Once more, it must not be a good so obvious and easy that every man in his ordinary state and condition is able to make the acquisition without labor or application. The absence of that good, which mere instinctive impulsive effort can secure, will never give origin to art. We may then define this reason, final cause, or motive, to be "the want or absence of something appearing good, relative to human life, and attainable by man; but superior to his natural and uninstructed faculties."

The only inquiry remaining, relates to the limit, or ultimate termination, of all its action, the end attained by it. This end is either an energy or a work. All art is expended either in present energy, or in a work completed. The former has a more direct application to mental arts, the latter to the fine arts. The execution of a piece of music; the strong working of poetical inspiration; the powerful appeals of eloquence; are so many exhibitions of a present acting and powerful energy. But the arts of design presenting themselves to us in the finished edifice, the perfect statue, the completed painting, afford us specimens of the work itself after the energy that produced it has ceased.

Thus bringing these various things together we would say that "art is an habitual power in man, of becoming the cause of some effect, according to a system of various and well approved precepts; that it acts only on the contingent, which is within the reach of the human powers to influence; that its final cause or motive is the absence or want of something appearing good, relative to human life, and attainable by man, but superior to his natural and uninstructed faculties; and that it will be accomplished and ended in an energy or a work."

Having thus defined art, its subject, final cause, and end, we proceed next to its classification. The topics we shall

include among the arts have a three-fold division. They are arranged according to the following plan:

1. Objective	Architecture. Sculpture. Painting.
2. Subjective	Music. Poetry. Eloquence.
3. Mixed....	Art Dramatic. Art Military.

The principle involved in this classification answers the inquiry where we may find that indefinable something, whether it be the beautiful, the sublime, or a hidden harmony, that reveals the true spirit and essence of art. In all those included in the first class it is to be found in the object. Whether it be the well proportioned structure, the faultless statue, or the splendid painting, it is from the object that the soul of art looks forth, to awaken in our æsthetic nature the love of itself. Hence we term this the objective. It includes the arts of design. It is intended to embrace all those cases in which genius seeks the realization of its high ideal, through the objective realities of the material world.

The second class embraces arts of a very different character. Genius is not here found going to external nature, transforming it into its own creations, and bringing it back to mind as the umpire of its success. It does not leave the place of its birth. It subjects the mind itself to its own dominion. Through the operation of powers that are purely mental, it breathes forth in tones of harmony and melody; embodies its bright conceptions of the ideal in the seraphic strains and harmonious numbers of poesy; and quickens thought, arouses passion, stirs the secret depths of the soul, and prompts to all life's activities,

through its insinuating, seductive and irresistible eloquence. It is, therefore, that we term this the subjective, the embodiment by the mind of its own powers for the accomplishment of its own purposes.

There is a third class of cases that do not appear to come exclusively under either the objective or subjective. The dramatic art derives from the subjective, or mind, the drama; while the pleasure experienced by the hearer arises wholly from its objective exhibition upon the stage. So also the military art is indebted to the subjective for its system of tactics, while their actual working in the siege and on the battle-field is wholly objective. We have, therefore, denominated this class mixed, as partaking both of the objective and subjective.

These are the principal arts excluding the merely useful, such as agriculture, gardening, the various manufacturing processes, and mechanic arts, which belong more appropriately to the element of industry.

and brick-making materials and facilities, have never been without their due weight and consideration.

2. The face of the country has no doubt had its influence upon the nature of its architecture.[1] In a hill country it is the position of the architectural structure that gives it importance: while in a level country it is the bulk that is more regarded. Amid mountain scenery it were vain to attempt by size of edifice to rival nature. But by position or location, thus cooperating with nature, an edifice having nothing imposing in its structure may acquire importance. On the contrary, in a flat, level country, like Egypt, human efforts have been combined in the erection of immensely massive structures, which may be seen looming up above the line of the horizon at great distances in every direction. It is their bulk, and not position, that gives importance.

3. The domestic architecture is influenced, and more or less controlled in its character, by the form of government, and prevailing habits of the people in reference to peace and war. The reign of feudalism substituted the baronial castle with its moat and drawbridge, in the place of the Roman villa, with its fine situation, tasty adornments and delightful grounds. So in the north of England, from the early part of the fourteenth century down the union of the two crowns of England and Scotland under one monarch, where a border warfare was almost incessantly carried on, no residence was deemed safe unless it had the means of defense, and hence towers, or castellated dwellings, were scattered all along the English and Scottish border.

4. The state of the country in relation to its wealth or poverty, and if wealthy the manner in which the wealth is controlled, has no small influence upon the character of its architecture. Wherever poverty prevails, neither the homes of the people, nor their public edifices, will exhibit any elegance in design, or beauty in execution. To subserve the mere necessities, or, at most, conveniences of life

[1] *London Quarterly*, 1844,-1847, p. 7.

and of business, is all they seek. But where wealth is at command, and especially where immense amounts are wielded by a single power, or a single mind, as has been at times the case with the Roman pontiff, the king of France, and the Russian emperor, we have seen structures of surpassing splendor rising at their command, developing many of the hidden beauties and grandeur that belong to architecture as an art.

5. The climate of the country; its greater or less subjection to cold or heat, its exposure to winds and storms, to snows and tempests, to earthquakes and tornadoes, to light and darkness, largely influences its style of architecture. The pointed roof and immense strength of the Gothic, has been referred by many to the storms and tempests that assail it; and more especially, to the heavy weight of descending snow that might endanger the safety of a building, the roof of which was flatter, and less protected. So in northern countries, and those obscured by fogs and clouds, larger provision must be made for the admission of light than in those, like Italy, where an ever cloudless sky interposes no obstacle to the full blaze of the solar luminary.

6. The architecture of a country is also influenced and controlled by the advance which its people have made in the development of all the other elements of humanity. The æsthetic nature, it is true, in which everything belonging to art receives its due appreciation, is not necessarily developed in proportion to the other natures with which it is associated in the individual, and yet by a law which is operative through an entire community, all the elements conducive to general civilization have nearly a coequal and harmonious development.

7. Not only are architectural structures, by their difference in form, proportion, structure, and general style, made to reflect the different degrees of civilization, under the influence of which they were reared; but a difference equally as great and striking is proclaimed in those architectural remains, which owe their origin to difference of race among mankind. Architecture is ethnographical. "It is thus,"

says a writer, "that looking on an ancient building, we can not only tell in what state of civilization its builders lived, or how far they were advanced in the arts; but we can almost certainly say also to what race they belonged, and what their affinities were with the other races or tribes of mankind. So far as my knowledge extends, I do not know a single exception to this rule;[1] and, as far as I can judge, I believe that architecture is in all instances as correct a test of race as language, and one far more easily applied and understood." This fact gives to every monument, coming under architectural criticism, a greater degree of interest and importance.

It should here be remarked that mere construction alone can present no claims for consideration as an embodiment of architectural art. So far as that is concerned it is properly the work of the engineer. He selects and arranges his materials, with a view to the production of an economical result in the most scientific manner. The laws that govern mere construction are very different from those that preside over the development of man's æsthetic nature. It is only when construction is wrested from its simple utilitarian purpose, and made to gratify a higher want, one deriving its origin from the ideal, that architecture can present any claim for consideration as an art. And then it does present such claim. The architect begins his work just where the engineer left it. He works upon the materials of the engineer, but the forms into which he moulds them, have no express reference to economy or utility. His arrangement of these materials is with reference to artistic effect, and by disposition of light and shade; by his harmony and contrast of form; by his variety of outline; he seeks the production of a result that shall awake the ideal to a sense of permanent beauty. All this he seeks merely by arrangement of material. And when to this he superadds such variety and depth of ornament as the nature of

[1] *Ferguson's Illustrated Hand Book*, I, lii.

his structure admits, and the suggestions of a refined taste sanction, his work may be considered complete.

Although what may be called the styles of architecture have considerable variety, yet they all are derived from and are modifications of, two great principles of mechanical construction. The widest and the most thorough generalization presents the entablature and the arch, as the two great original contructive forms, out of which grow all the vast varieties of architectural designs. To realize the necessity of employing one of these two in every architectural work, we need only perceive the necessity in its completion of doing something more than simply raising uprights whether they be piers, posts, pillars or walls. These alone could never form a structure. Some kind of union of these at the top must be effected before any edifice can be constructed. It is in the different modes of effecting this union that we find the point from which diverge the two lines out of which grow all the varieties of architectural style. The one is by simply placing on the top of the two uprights,[1] which are at such distances from each other as to avoid all breakage from mere weight; a third, or horizontal mass, which is held together by mere cohesion. This may be done wholly independent of material, as it is obvious that beams of wood or blocks of stone will equally well accomplish it. This is the union effected by the entablature, the definition of which is, "the superstructure which lies horizontally upon the columns in classic architecture."

In the other an union is also effected, but by different means and upon a different principle. It is not by a single block, or mass, kept together by cohesion, but by a series of such blocks, or other similar substances, bound together without any visible support, and sustained by a curious and wonderful law of the mechanical powers. It is by the structure of the arch, which is defined to be "a construction of bricks, or stones, over an opening so arranged as by mutual pressure to support each other

[1] *Freeman*, 20.

and to become capable of sustaining a superincumbent weight."

All structures of every description come under one of these two principles, and hence the two leading styles of architecture proceeding directly from them, develop them the more fully as time and opportunity are afforded for that purpose. Every definite style of architecture proceeds from the entablature or the arch, and adapts its forms and details to this construction. The one or the other constitutes the animating principle in obedience to which, not only the structure is reared, but also the various decorations and ornamental embellishments are selected and used.

The style which adopts the entablature may be called the horizontal style. Its structures are generally less lofty, but cover large areas. They creep along the earth with little or nothing of upward aspiration. The upright pillar or wall, with the superincumbent mass that binds them together, present the only principle that controls their structures. Into the capitals of their pillars, and the divisions of their entablatures might be introduced ornament and decoration. So the elegant proportions of different parts of the edifice may be such as to produce a pleasing effect.

The style which adopts the arch is very appropriately termed vertical. It has an upward, and not a horizontal development. This is accomplished by means of piers and arches, which may be made to rise successively over each other; at least the arches may shoot off in succession one above another from different or the same continuous piers or columns. This, also, as we shall see, has its peculiar species of decoration and ornament.

Of these two styles, the horizontal was the earliest developed. Although the arch was certainly known in Egypt, and probably in Greece, yet it did not enter into the architecture of either of those people. So, also, in the early Pelasgian or Cyclopean monuments, the ruins of which are still found in Greece and Italy, there appears to be a dim foreshadowing of the arch principle and a striv-

ing to arrive at it, but without ever actually reaching it, at least so as to embody it in a style of architecture. The earliest structures among a rude people are always after the horizontal mode. The Celtic remains of north-western Europe, those wonderful Druidical structures of Stonehenge, Avebury and Carnac, are all of this character. They all consist of stones piled together upon the principle of the entablature, and adhering together by force of gravitation.

It was the Greek who gave to this form of art a grace and loveliness before unknown. Among them it found its complete development. Its structures were faultless in proportion, beautiful in outline, and when its three orders of architecture, Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian, arrived at their full completion, forms of perfection were produced that seemed unsurpassed by human skill. Grecian architecture was productive of one form of the most perfect beauty,[1] but that seemed to be all it was capable of producing. Every structure followed the same general type, presenting the same outline, and the same features both constructive and decorative. No variety was attainable except by diversities of detail, and of proportion. This is, perhaps, a difficulty inherent in the horizontal style. If it had not been, Grecian genius would most certainly have surmounted it.

One great cycle in the history of architecture reaches its furthest limit in Greece. That cycle was designed, and actually did accomplish the entire development of the entablature. From the roughest specimens to the most perfect productions, from the Druidical circle to the portico of the Parthenon, we witness a regular series in advancement until the refined taste of the Greek left nothing wanting to the full and perfect completion of this style. All there was in it was thus brought out, and the age of Pericles was the final consummation of everything it had in its power to offer.

---

[1] *Freeman*, 25.

With the arch commences another cycle in the history of architectural art, and like every other great agent of progress, it is slow and progressive in its development. The capacities of the arch, and its adaptations to different varieties of architecture, required almost twenty centuries fully to develop. Although known undoubtedly both in Egypt and in Greece, yet in neither did it form any marked feature in architectural construction. It is not until we arrive in Italy that we find the arch employed as a principle in construction. It appears to have been in use among the ancient Etruscans, and by them was communicated to the Romans.

In Roman architecture the arch was the predominant mechanical feature. It was mainly by means of it that the Romans were enabled to accomplish so much by their architectural labors. In their palmiest days, the resources of the world were open to them, and those who had persistent energy sufficient to subdue the world sought by their gigantic structures, to leave lessons in marble for all coming time. They have been reckoned among the best builders, but the poorest architects the world has ever seen. Their architectural works have been of great magnitude, of vast design, and of wonderful mechanical skill, and boldness of execution. Look at their Coliseum, their amphitheatres, temples and aqueducts, many of them on a scale of vastness beyond what had been ever before witnessed. But as architects they neglected the opportunity, so fairly presented, of completing a national round arched style. While the arch, with its piers and imposts, constituted the real frame work of their fabrics, they resorted to the beautiful Grecian models for their ornamentation. Thus the forms of Grecian art, although beautiful in themselves, were, nevertheless, a disturbing element in Roman architecture; and it is only where that element the least prevails that the real Roman construction, the pier and the round arch, comes out in all its purity and majesty, and exercises so wide and lasting an influence upon the architecture of the entire civilized world.

The architectural history of modern Europe is the most fully proclaimed from the churches and edifices consecrated to religion. It is these that have commanded the largest resources; that afford examples of the highest styles of architecture of every people; and that have proved the most enduring as to time. It is, therefore, in the architecture of modern Europe, Christian art which is the real subject of study. The architecture of Europe, since the downfall of the Roman empire, may be included under five great divisions, viz:

I. The Byzantine, or style originating in Byzantium or rather Constantinople, and used by all the Slavonic races of Europe as contradistinguished from the Teutonic, and generally by all belonging to the Greek church.

II. The Romanesque, or Christianized Roman.

III. The Gothic, or that style practiced by the Teutonic, or Celtic races, wherever they predominated in Europe.

IV. The Renaissance, or attempt to return to the classic forms of Greece and Rome consequent upon the revival of letters.

V. Modern architecture.

I. *Byzantine Architecture.*

This, although not the earliest, is, nevertheless, introduced the first, as being the most eastern; as prevailing among a particular race and symbolizing a religious sect nowhere else prevailing; and more especially as exhibiting forms of ecclesiastical art, unique and peculiar, and deriving nothing from Roman and Teutonic elements. All the other kinds we shall find resulting from the Teutonic alone, or that and the Roman, or Roman and Grecian combined. This style applies only to that form of art invented in Constantinople after its virtual separation from the wester empire, and practiced by the Greek church during tl whole of the middle ages.

The Byzantine builders of Constantinople were away from Rome and its resources. They were compelled to find their own materials, and to originate their own style. Besides, their location placed them in the east rather than the west, and hence, by necessity, subjected them to oriental influences.

The history of this style of architecture is divided into three periods: The first extends from the time of Constantine to that of Justinian. Very few monuments of that period are now remaining. The second extends from Justinian to the eleventh century, and it is this period that presents us with the pure forms of Byzantine architecture. The third, beginning with the eleventh century, extends to the final conquest of the Greeks by the Turks, includes the period of the Venetian conquests, and exhibits the marked influence of Italian features and details.

The main feature that serves more especially to characterize this style is the dome or cupola. This is its crowning majestic ornament, its life and soul, to which every other feature is subordinate. This feature had not here its origin, but its use had hitherto been mainly confined to circular buildings. Here it was employed as the central point of a Christian temple, and involved a revolution in the existing principles of architecture.

The principal difficulty encountered was how it should be sustained: . A dome, when constructed in Rome, was supported on a circular drum of solid masonry, and as long as the Byzantine architects confined themselves to domes placed on octagons, or supported by eight piers, they had no great difficulties to contend with. This, however, practically limited the church to the space below the dome.[1] To obviate this they placed the dome on four instead of eight piers, filling up the whole angle of the square by a great bracket. By this means the building could be extended in any direction, without contracting its dimensions. It gave also the power of adding domes or semidomes of

[1] *Ferguson*, II, 947.

any required size or form, all of which could aid in carrying the eye to the great dome, and by contrast of dimension much increase its apparent size.

In accordance with these principles the churches were at first round or octagonal. They were afterwards square, the nave being a little extended in length, four columns occupying the centre and supporting the cupola, or dome. The bracketing of the angles furnished the pendentives, which could sufficiently resist the outward thrust of the dome. The extremities of the nave were covered with hemispherical cupolas. The façade presented a square without gables, and terminated by a cornice with salient and reentrant angles.[1] Apses were also in use, often three in number, more generally semicircular than polygonal.

The Byzantine architecture sacrificed everything to the dome, making that the centre, the crowning point of all, to which every other portion of the pile converges and rests under the shadow of its majestic canopy. "The western limb of the basilica is too long, the others too short; its oblong form is, therefore, rejected, and the church assumes a square or octagonal form; the surrounding portions only radiating around, and supporting the vast central cupola; nave, choir, transepts, chapels, being little more than its supports and accessories, existing only to lift it soaring above them.[2] And not only did the grand cupola crown the whole pile, but the smaller portions are often covered with smaller domes and semidomes, so as to render the outline of a large Greek church totally unintelligible to one accustomed only to the buildings of the west. The eye habituated to the long naves and triple towers of our own great churches is totally bewildered in contemplating so huge a pile with apses and semidomes sprouting out in every direction, and all circling round the vast central cupola, swelling its majesty, like tributary rulers encircling an imperial throne."

---

[1] *Freeman*, 168. [2] *Idem*, 167.

The most perfect, complete, and splendid sample of the Byzantine style is the church of St. Sophia, erected in Constantinople by Justinian. It is nearly an exact square of two hundred and twenty-nine feet north and south by two hundred and forty-three feet from east to west, surmounted in the centre by a great dome one hundred and seven feet in diameter, rising to a height of one hundred and eighty-two feet from the floor of the church.[1] East and west of this are two semidomes of the same diameter; these are again cut into, each by three smaller semidomes, supported by two tiers of pillars. The great dome is pierced by forty windows, and the greater and smaller semidomes each with five.

The Greek church, constructed according to the Byzantine style, presents a very extraordinary union of contending principles.[2] Although in its ground plan it is usually a mere square, yet it nevertheless preserves the cross form as distinctly as a Latin cathedral. The square is broken up by the four limbs rising above the portions which fill up its angles, and these again converge and support the circular cupola crowning the whole. In its minor features is also carried out the principle of cutting up the flat outline. Curved lines are everywhere sought for until even the outline of the cupola itself becomes interrupted in this manner. This style is a pure offspring of the arch, as it is that which produces the vault, and the vault the cupola. As between the pier and the column, the Byzantine style selects the former, as forming a stronger and much more appropriate support for cupolas. Where the column is employed very little regard is paid to classical proportions.

The Byzantine style was characterized by considerable elegance, with occasional combinations of a high order.[3] It was the age of Justinian that gave to it its greatest grandeur, and enabled it to rank among the great styles of the earth. From that period its history is one of decline until its final extinction caused by the conquests by the Venetians and Turks.

---

[1] *Ferguson*, II, 950. [2] *Freeman*, 170. [3] *Ferguson*, II, 962.

This style of architecture exerted an influence up western Europe. This was particularly observable Ravenna and Venice. In the former, the Church of Vitalis, erected in A.D. 547, presents the oriental charact of being octagonal in form; its root being a magnific cupola;[1] and having around the arcade a succession of sm apses, divided, after the oriental manner, into galleries s ported by columns of a completely Byzantine character.

In the latter city the magnificent cathedral of St. Ma commenced near the close of the tenth century, presents appearance quite anomalous in its general character. its façade, pointed arches and pinnacles, it points to Gothic age. Within are the columns and arches that giv a basilican character. But above and over all soar its f cupolas, or domes, one placed over the intersection of Greek cross, and one over each of the four great lim These domes, however, are different from that of St. Sopl more resembling those of Saracenic origin, and prevail among Mahometan nations. It may be possible that western Christian and the eastern infidel may h developed in the same path from the common Byzant source.

II. *The Romanesque, or Christianized Roman Architecture*

The early Romanesque, or debased Roman, grew ou one of the features which characterized the later exhibiti of Roman architecture. The round arched style was ess tially Roman, but the direction and character of its u mate development depended very much upon that wh contributed to its support. This is the pier, used her the sense of any support for an arch. The form of it r either be a mere mass of wall, square or otherwise d rated, or it may be a real pillar. The latter is borro

[1] *Freeman*, 175. [2] *Idem*, 175.

from the Grecian system, and hence is a link connecting it with an earlier style of architecture. The former is original in its character; grew out of the necessities of the case; is the natural and legitimate treatment of the arch; and, therefore, harmonizes much the best with the solidity and sturdiness of a round arched style. It is interesting to notice in the palace of Dioclesian at Spalatio, the attempts of architecture, while using the column, to emancipate itself from the style to which the column properly belonged. In almost all its arcades the entablature has nearly vanished, and in its place the arch springs boldly from the capital of the column. Thus the fact is rendered apparent that the arch is destined to supplant the entablature, even upon that which had hitherto been the main support of the latter.

When the Christian religion came to supplant the pagan forms of worship, an imperative want was felt for a church edifice in which the Christians might congregate for worship. There existed, it is true, the heathen temple, but that was never designed, and was illy adapted to Christian worship. The object of that was to present a splendid exterior display. In the interior, it was pent in by four blank walls, was of small extent, dark and dreary in aspect, and designed to be accessible to the priesthood alone. The Christian worship, on the contrary, required the assembling together of worshipers. This originated the necessity of internal adornment, and required large spaces for the accommodation of their assemblies. Hence size of edifice, interior arrangement, and fine architectural design and execution, became demands that were clamorous for gratification. All these conditions could not be immediately supplied by the erection of new buildings. Of those already erected, the temple was entirely inadequate. Recourse was therefore had to the basilica, or hall of justice, in which courts were held and justice administered. This already possessed the long nave separated by arcades from its smaller aisles, sometimes a single one, sometimes two on either side. In some cases was even to be found a kind

of transept,[1] called chalcidica, crossed the aisles at end. In most cases, the large central avenue was minated by a semicircular apse, in which was conta the seat of the presiding magistrate. In this is found complete type of the Christian church, such as has mor less prevailed from the age of Constantine to the pre time. The nave is that part westward of the choi which the congregation assemble. The aisles, one or n of them are the lateral divisions, or wings, for such is relation they bear to the body of the church. The tran is that part of the church which projects at right an from the body, being of equal or nearly equal height t It is this which gives to the church its cruciform arra ment, and hence the finding of this in a heathen bas has been hailed as already foreshadowing the fu triumph of the cross. The apse is a semicircular re at the eastern end of the church, and usually vau with a semidome.

Thus in the old basilica all the necessary arrangem for Christian worship seemed already made. The a had only to be placed at the end of the nave, on the cl of the apse. The bishop's throne behind it took the p of that of the judge. The subordinate seats of the pre tery were ranged on either side of the bishop along walls of the semicircle.

The choir for the inferior ministers was formed in nave by screening off a sufficient space in front of the a while the long nave and aisles accommodating the con gation, the lateral division maintaining the requi separation of the sexes. To the west end, not as t but long subsequently understood, was attached a port This, in the church, was the place for catechumens penitents, and, as the place for discipline, was called narthex. This in time developed itself into a cloister open square surrounded by pillars which is found in m early churches.

---

[1] *Freeman*, 155.

This change of the basilica into a church has not failed to attract attention to its moral aspect. From the hall of justice, the judgment seat of the Cæsars, the Christian martyr had received his sentence, and been led away to his crown of martyrdom. In that same building was now upreared the altar, where holy gifts were offered over that martyr's relics. It seemed like a just retribution to that power that had too often tyrannized in the name of justice.

This early Romanesque, more frequently called basilican style of architecture, had little to commend it externally. There was nothing of the spreading dome of the Byzantine, or the soaring spire of the Gothic minster. Nothing was presented but a long dead wall, unbroken by porch or buttress, by cupola or tower.[1] In front was a low portico, and above it three long, round-headed, undivided windows, symmetrically arranged, and above these, a round window in the pediment. Within, however, were long rows of columns supporting round arches, which were of continuous sweep, unbroken by a keystone, and resting on the capitals of the pillars. The wall rises considerably above the arcades, a gallery being sometimes present, and sometimes absent. Except in the conch of the apse, the vault, as a covering, does not appear in the ancient basilica. The wall, supported by columns of classical proportions, was not of sufficient thickness to sustain one. The roofs were wooden. The basilican architecture, although containing within itself all the main elements which were to constitute the future Gothic, yet presented them so detached, so disjointedly, in such lifeless juxtaposition, that the general effect, as an artistic arrangement, was destroyed.

Contemporaneously with the basilican, there was another style of ecclesiastical building in Italy, and that was the circular form. This was either round or polygonal, the former characterizing the sepulchral chapel, the latter the baptistry. This style of structure had a roof, which was domical within,[2] with an external cone, the aisles being

[1] *Freeman*, 157. [2] *Idem*, 162.

vaulted. The chief constructive principle of Roman arc tecture we have seen to be the round arch, and here becomes, for the first time, the great source of decoratic the architect having mastered the great law that, in complete and perfect architecture, the construction and th decoration must be derived from the same source.

There was a new style of Romanesque still deriving muc from the old Roman, but approaching still nearer to th Gothic than the basilican, introduced into Italy by th Lombard. It is sometimes called the Lombard styl This was about A. D. 568. These Teutonic migrators ha no architects or architecture of their own, but while the employed those of the conquered country, they infused int their works a new spirit. They gave new forms to th pillars, and their more extended application as decorativ features.[1] They added a new style of sculpture. The originated a new ground plan and outline of churches, ex tended very much the use of vaulting, and, what ver much changed the appearance of buildings, introduce steeples or belfries. In the interior, they often introduce piers formed of clustered columns, the pier being lowe while each separate shaft was frequently longer than wa allowable by classical precedent. The Lombards resorte to constructive features as a source of decoration, an covered the exterior of their richer buildings with an infi nite number of small arcades resting on ornamental shaft of various forms and proportions. Sometimes these ar found detached, thus forming actual galleries. At other they are merely decorative enrichments of a blank surface A whole façade is sometimes found covered with ro upon row of these arcades, resting on shafts single o double, detached or engaged, plain, fluted, twisted, a suited the taste and caprice of the designer.

In the Lombard structures we find the strong sturd pier in the place of the slender column of the basilica This enabled their architects to substitute the stone vaul

[1] *Freeman*, 177.

in the place of the wooden roof, which was often done. The first form of it was plain barrel vaulting, but subsequently cross-vaulting with groined ribs was introduced. These were often supported by tall shafts rising directly from the ground.

The church is made to assume the shape of a Latin cross, and of its four arms the western was much the longest. At the point of junction an octagon was frequently reared on a square base, forming an internal dome and presenting without a conical roof. One or more apses of a semi-circular form were to be found at the east end, the apse end being always termed east, and the entrance end west. These,[1] with the Lombards, were low, distinct buildings, a gallery of open arches often running round the upper part. The church exteriorly presented a low roof, and consequently no prominent gables, and having no buttresses or pinnacles, the façades were flat, and the whole outline but little marked or varied. But the feature of peculiar interest to which the Christian temple in all future time is indebted to the Lombard architecture is the campanile, bell tower, or steeple. This was and has ever since remained, a feature peculiarly Christian. No pagan temple ever possessed it. No mosque of the false prophet ever tolerates it. It is only where worshipers are wont to assemble that the tones of the bell are chimed forth to call them together.

The Lombard campanile was usually separated from the church, or was merely connected with it as an adjunct, and not as an integral part. It was in the form of a tall, round, thin tower, unbroken by buttresses, and usually covered with a pyramidical capping. Octagonal stages crowned with spires are often found, but these are, in many cases, later additions.

The Romanesque style improved upon crossing the Alps, and enlisted the efforts of the German nations. Here the towers, which in Italy had stood apart from the church, were united with, and made an essential part of, the fabric.

---

[1] *Freeman*, 188.

They were seized upon as beautiful appendages, were shaped in various forms, as square, round, or octagonal. They had a variety of capping, from the low pyramidical roof to the lofty spire, and were made to flank every front and fill up every angle of the larger buildings.

A change somewhat similar was also made in the apse. This also in Italy, and during the period of pure Romanesque, was a distinct part of the church, and attached to a front, although inferior in height and width. But in Germany it was attached to and made a part of the church. The Germans were not satisfied with a single apse at the east end. They were often introduced at both ends of a large church, and were attached both to the fronts and to the eastern faces of the transepts. The square pier was the most characteristic of this style, but the column was not excluded, especially in those churches which were not vaulted.

The triforium is a gallery or arcade in the wall over the pier-arches, which separate the body from the aisles of the church. This in the German Romanesque was by no means a necessary feature, nor very conspicuous when it occurred. As it was not used as a gallery, it appears to have been omitted, or treated as a subordinate feature.

A very interesting style of the early Romanesque is to be found in the island of Ireland.[1] Here are the earliest existing Christian temples in northern Europe, not deriving their origin from the basilica, but from the lowly shrines of the days of persecution. They are small and unadorned, and, what points to a creation prior to the basilican model, they are destitute of an apse. Its type is of the simplest kind, consisting merely of a quadrangular chamber, entered by a single doorway at the west end, and in the larger churches, connected by an arch with another chamber to the east, forming the chancel. The churches were small, varying between sixty and thirty feet in length, compensating fo their diminished size by their greater number. There i

[1] *Freeman*, 196.

a great similarity between these and the Pelasgic remains in Greece. This, however, is regarded by some merely as accidental.

There are other buildings in Ireland, besides churches, which are of great antiquity. There are small oratories and houses supposed to have been the dwelling places of the earliest saints. There are also round towers, supposed to have been detached campaniles, which served not only for bell towers, but also as beacons and places for refuge in case of a sudden assault. They are found as the companions of churches, and frequently possessing Christian symbols. Their architecture corresponds with that of the churches of their own date. They are proportionally taller and thinner than the Italian campanile, and covered with a low conical capping.[1] The doorways are placed high, showing that they were also intended for defense.

We can have very little certainty in regard to the remains of Saxon architecture. The Saxons, on their settlement in Britain, appear to have employed wood principally as their building material. Even down to the time of the conquest they employed wood mostly in their buildings. Besides, there is difficulty in discriminating and deciding with certainty what is purely Saxon. As far as can be ascertained, they followed the usual type of the Latin church in regard to the chancel,[2] nave, and aisles, with their arcades and clerestory. The apse, although not excluded, is not of frequent occurrence. The piers were large and square; pier arches rare, chancel and belfry arches not uncommon. The old Saxon tower was a rude imitation of the Italian campanile. It was hard in outline, unbuttressed, and possessed much barbaric grandeur. The Earl's Barton is an undoubted relic of Saxon architecture.

There are two forms of the pier in the Romanesque style. In the one it is a rectangular mass,[3] in the other a column. These two forms are illustrated in the Saxon and Norman architecture. The former is Saxon; the latter

[1] *Freeman*, 201. [2] *Idem*, 208. [3] *Idem*, 215.

Norman. If the Norman is not actually columnar it is at least constructed on the columnar principle. The Saxon arch, on the contrary, is in its essence perfectly rectangular, not channelled or divided, but simply having roll mouldings attached to its square surface.

The development of the Romanesque, which is possessed of peculiar interest to the Anglo-Saxon inquirer, is the Norman. Some have denied this to be Romanesque, but insist that it is incipient Gothic. There is no doubt but that the Norman does point strongly towards the Gothic, and still its style is ranked as a pure Romanesque development. The Normans did not bring over with them a new style, but they did bring over better constructive processes, a more perfect conception,[1] and a more excellent manner of treating the style already in use. Their type of a church was cruciform, the nave being of great length, amounting almost to a deformity. The transepts are shorter, and the choir, although comparatively small, is not hidden by turrets, but stands out boldly as a distinct part of the church. It is apsidal, but without diverging chapels, and sometimes without a surrounding aisle. The tower is made to rise from the point of intersection between the nave and transept. It is sometimes gabled, but more commonly covered with a conical roof or spire. The west front is usually flanked by two lighter towers, which terminate the aisles. Smaller turrets occasionally occur in other positions, but no large ones, as in Germany, at the east end. The towers are square, and it is the central and western ones that give magnificence to the outline of the church.

The end of the nave below the gable was occupied by two rows of small round-headed windows. The gable itself was very plain. So also the towers were plain before arriving at the point at which they became clear of the church. In their upper portion they were profusely decorated with arcades, and usually relieved at the angles by flat pilasters.

In the larger Norman churches the east or apse end was

---

[1] *Ferguson*, II, 846.

usually terminated by an apse, while in the west was the entrance door, which in the smaller churches, was often of great richness below, while above was a single row of arches, one or more being pierced as windows, and also a gable left plain,[1] or pierced with one or more windows. So also pilasters formed by projection, or by recessing the ornamental parts, usually flank the sides, but pinnacles or turrets scarcely occur. The front is commonly divided vertically into two or three compartments by pilasters, and horizontally by strings into three ranges, answering to the arcade, triforium, and clerestory of the interior; each of the divisions thus formed being occupied by a window. The aisles generally followed the same rule, making a fourth and fifth vertical division, and having the two lower ranges of windows continued across them.

The special mission of the Romanesque style of architecture seems to have been to develop perfectly the round arched construction. The round arch occupies in architecture a middle ground between the entablature and the pointed arch. It is the entablature rounded, and thus bridging over the space intervening between the horizontal and the vertical style of architecture, as it thus presents itself as a kind of transitional agent between the horizontal and the vertical style, the question arises whether there is an ideal perfection of the round arched construction, in the same sense as there admittedly is, of the entablature and of the pointed arch? To this it is answered that although the ideal perfection of the arch is to be found in the pointed style, yet the round arch does certainly exist as a construction, and is as mechanically excellent as any other, and is also a portion of a figure, the circle, which is confessedly beautiful. It has, therefore, its own æsthetical character, distinct alike from the entablature and the pointed arch. So, also, it has its system of ornament consistent with the round, but inconsistent with the pointed arch. It consorts harmoniously with the massive pier

[1] *Freeman*, 233.

which supports it, but not with the soaring clustered pillar which attends the pointed style. All this certainly tends to show that the round arch has its appropriate treatment parallel to that of the pointed, and consequently has an ideal of perfection in which this treatment shall be most completely and consistently carried out.

But there is a great distinctness of the two as mere styles of architecture. "The Romanesque is the development of the round arched construction,[1] and as such has totally different principles from Gothic, the development of the pointed. While the whole soul of Gothic architecture is the vertical line, and while the horizontal stands in a like relation to that of Greece, the distinguishing feature of Romanesque is that neither is allowed to obtain a marked predominance. The other two imply extension, almost motion, in their respective directions. The Gothic minster seems absolutely to rise from the ground; the Grecian temple seems to stretch away to some distant point of the horizon. But in Romanesque the great characters are rest and solidity, an enduring, an immovable firmness, which seems inconsistent with any very strong carrying out of either of the other notions. The eye is neither carried up an infinite series of vertical lines, nor yet does it run along the long line of entablature. It rests on the supporting piers and supported arches, not growing out of their support as in the arborescent Gothic, not laid on them as something distinct, like the long beam of the entablature; neither idea comes out forcibly; the arch simply exists in its immovable firmness, resting on its support, without raising any inquiries as to how it came there. All this is the natural character of the round arch. Channel it with the continuous mouldings of the pointed, or place it on the gracefully clustered shaft, and its own purity is gone without its acquiring the distinct and opposite purity of the other forms. It desiderates its own square section, and its own massive pier.

---

[1] *Freeman*, 260.

"Every feature in the Romanesque must be solid, and furnished with its due support; the parts must retain a strongly marked individuality, so that each may of itself be sufficient to arrest the eye, and not be a mere link in a horizontal or vertical series. The light and airy character of the Gothic is therefore a total stranger to its predecessor. The former endeavors to render the supporting masses as slight as is consistent with real and apparent security, it connects every part with every other, and fuses all into one harmonious whole. Romanesque, on the other hand, delights in the appearance of strength afforded by the massive pier and round arch, and the vast unbuttressed wall. All the parts retain their separate existence; the pier of every form has a strongly marked impost or capital; the compound pier is not fused into one composition,[1] like the fully developed cluster, but at most has independent shafts attached as something extraneous; and each of these has its own well defined boundary in the square abacus. The square section brings the arch, as a distinct feature, far more forcibly upon the eye. It at once shows more plainly its construction, hinders the continuity of the Gothic architrave, and retains a separate existence for each of its orders. The same principle will be found carried out in the triforium, the clerestory, and all the other features of the building. All remain distinct. There is no attempt at subordination of parts to more comprehensive parts, or to the whole, or at making one fit into another. Rest and immobility are the ideas impressed upon every stone."

The Romanesque is claimed to be not an imperfect Gothic, but a distinct form of Christian architecture, having its own principles, beauties, and moral teaching.

The Romanesque style had its inception with the Lombard. All the great features begin to be designed according to Romanesque principles. The true manner of decorating plain surfaces was arrived at, and that germ of all that was grand and beautiful, the campanile, was added. While the

[1] *Freeman*, 281.

Lombard style was actively at work on the basilican form of churches, the Byzantine was carrying out the domical.

The next advance was made north of the Alps, and the German Romanesque is found fully carrying out the Lombard idea. Both this and the Norman, put in about equal claims as to the perfecting of this style of architecture. The boldness and vigor of the latter are in harmony with the native genius of that conquering race.

Between the German and Norman styles there were some distinctions. The former has two octagons and four towers, or four towers only, all of about the same height, and forming two groups balancing each other. But there is no centre, no one point of unity around which the other portions of the building circle. In the Norman the arrangement is different. There is there no balancing, no distracting equality. At the point of intersection of the nave and transept rises a tower, which thus is made to form a centre of unity. At the west end rises two towers, which being subordinated to the central, produce by their combination with it, a pyramidical outline of the greatest beauty.

The double apse of many of the German churches is a peculiarity which has an unfortunate effect. It breaks in upon the otherwise uniform custom of regarding the apse or altar end as the eastern end of the church, and the other, or entrance, as the western end. The apse at each end necessarily confounds the two. Upon entering the church the triforium, the gallery, or arcade in the wall, over the pier arches, which separate the body from the aisles of the church, assumes in the Norman style the importance which it lacks in the German, and there is more unity in the lateral elevations. The pier also receives greater variety, and capability, and while the column and the rectangular pier are retained, the massive cylindrical pillar is also introduced. The use of the shaft is more fully developed, a fewer flat surfaces are treated as columns or pilasters. Under all these circumstances, the Norman style is generally considered as the most perfect and fully developed form of Romanesque.

This latter may be regarded as the point of union between the waning civilization of Rome, and the rising power of the Teutonic races. Assuming the old basilica as the premises given, they modeled upon it a higher and a better style of art. They found it a remove from the horizontal style, and they approximated it still nearer to the vertical. But the lingering influence of Rome still was paramount. The traces of that power that had reduced a subject world under its dominion, were slow in utterly disappearing. The system of chivalrous and feudal Europe had not yet received its development. The Teutonic races, although politically conquerors, had not yet achieved an intellectual supremacy. In arts, in laws, in all that civilizes, that enlightens, and humanizes the mind, they were content to be the followers of those over whom they bore sway, But the time was to come when they could and would assert their own supremacy; and when as the evidence of it as the embodiment of their principles, and as the symbol of their own free, unfettered, and upward aspirations, they would send up towards heaven the tall shaft, the soaring arch, and the airy spire; when in the fullness of time they would perfect the Gothic style of architecture.

Before entering upon the consideration of the Gothic style it seems proper to notice briefly another element that has entered, although not to a very large extent, into the architecture of a portion of the south of Europe. I allude to the Arabian, or Saracenic, style, brought by the Saracens or Moors into Spain, firmly established there, and from that point influencing the style of other places, particularly Sicily. It has also been claimed that this style contained the lifeless seed which, under more genial influences, grew up into the "pillared forest of the Gothic minster." In its possession and use of the pointed arch it was certainly a foreshadowing of the Gothic style.

As a style of architecture, however, the Saracenic has little to recommend it beyond the excessive richness and gorgeousness of its buildings, and the romantic associations connected with them. But the splendor has been styled

mere barbaric magnificence superadded to fantastic and inconsistent forms, lifeless germs which existed for ages without developing into the features which would seem to be their natural results. It possessed the pointed arch for twelve hundred years, using it systematically as a favorite form, and yet never superadded to it the mouldings which are its natural accompaniments. It dealt in excess of ornament, and in strange forms given to arches and cupolas. It delighted in astonishing the eye with vastness of superstructure raised and sustained upon apparently the most feeble means of support.

It is generally in arcades or colonnades that those features are found which most decisively stamp the character of a style. But here the relation between the arch and its support is badly maintained. The capital is surmounted with a mass of masonry, serving only to crush the column, and cut it off from all connection with the arch. Its frequent use of the horse-shoe arch is also deemed faulty, as, when that occurs, the pier does not support the arch, but the arch seems crushing or falling off the pier.

Not only in the pointed arch, but also in the minor ornaments, are to be found isolated Gothic features. Such, for instance, is the panelling, filled with quatrefoils, or with other figures either actually found in that style, or not incompatible with it. Some of the ornaments, however, are more Romanesque than Gothic. There are found lavish splendor, tinsel decorations and walls where not an inch is left unadorned with sumptuous carving.

The one single edifice that combines magnitude of design, vast extent of arrangement, gorgeousness of decoration, and it may be added, peculiar defects in the style itself, is the splendid palace of the Moorish kings of Granada, the Alhambra. This was conceived and executed in a style of more than oriental magnificence. The imagination almost tires in attempting to grasp the realization of the embodiment of so much splendor. So far as mere decoration is concerned, no edifice in the world can compare with its s y halls. Every inch of wall was covered with ara-